

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

CAROL A. SIMMONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Civil Action 2:17-cv-1096
Judge Algenon L. Marbley
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers**

**COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,**

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On December 15, 2017, Plaintiff filed this action under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) for review of a decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her application for benefits. (ECF No. 1.) On March 16, 2018, Plaintiff was ordered to show cause, within fourteen days, why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to effect service of process and why the Court should allow an extension of time to effect service. (ECF No. 2.) To date, Plaintiff has not moved for an extension of time to effect service or otherwise responded to the Show Cause Order. It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that the Court dismiss this action without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) for failure to effect timely service of process.

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the Report and

Recommendation, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *See, e.g., Pfahler v. Nat'l Latex Prod. Co.*, 517 F.3d 816, 829 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that “failure to object to the magistrate judge’s recommendations constituted a waiver of [the defendant’s] ability to appeal the district court’s ruling”); *United States v. Sullivan*, 431 F.3d 976, 984 (6th Cir. 2005) (holding that defendant waived appeal of district court’s denial of pretrial motion by failing to timely object to magistrate judge’s report and recommendation). Even when timely objections are filed, appellate review of issues not raised in those objections is waived. *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) (“[A] general objection to a magistrate judge’s report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not suffice to preserve an issue for appeal”) (citation omitted)).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: April 3, 2018

/s/ Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers
ELIZABETH A. PRESTON DEAVERS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE